

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON
EUGENE DIVISION

JAMES R. WILLIAMS,

Case No. 6:17-cv-00504-TC
ORDER

Plaintiff,

vs.

STATE OF OREGON, Department of
Justice, ELLEN F. ROSENBLUM, in
her individual capacity as Attorney General
of the State of Oregon, and FREDERICK
M. BOSS, in his individual and official
capacity, as the Deputy Attorney General of
the State of Oregon,

Defendant.

AIKEN, District Judge:

Magistrate Judge Thomas Coffin filed his Findings and Recommendation ("F&R") (doc. 52) on 10/23/2018 recommending that this action should be dismissed. This case is now before me. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b).

No objections have been timely filed. Although this relieves me of my obligation to perform a *de novo* review, I retain the obligation to "make an informed, final decision." *Britt v.*

Simi Valley Unified Sch. Dist., 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983), *overruled on other grounds*, *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121–22 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc). The Magistrates Act does not specify a standard of review in cases where no objections are filed. *Ray v. Astrue*, 2012 WL 1598239, *1 (D. Or. May 7, 2012). Following the recommendation of the Rules Advisory Committee, I review the F&R for “clear error on the face of the record[.]” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note (1983) (citing *Campbell v. United States District Court*, 501 F.2d 196, 206 (9th Cir. 1974)); *see also United States v. Vonn*, 535 U.S. 55, 64 n.6 (2002) (stating that, “[i]n the absence of a clear legislative mandate, the Advisory Committee Notes provide a reliable source of insight into the meaning of” a federal rule). Having reviewed the file of this case and Magistrate Judge Coffin’s order, I find no clear error.

Thus, I adopt Magistrate Judge Coffin’s F&R (doc. 52) in its entirety. Accordingly, this action is dismissed as outlined in the F&R.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this 12th day of February, 2019.



Ann Aiken
United States District Judge